5/7/70

Dear Harold,

Something very important has happened and, without being able to contact you, I had to make my own decision. I hope I did not do wrong--don't think I did.

At about 6pm last night, I found out that Specter was to be on Jack McKinney's show that night, starting at ten. I thought this would be a good opportunity for me to confront S with an "un-answerable" question before the public, where I might even be able to debate him in a sense.(McKinney's show is solely call-ins).

The first thought which struck me was to call you and see if you wanted to take advantage of this. However, I also thought I should seek your advise on this and what to ask. I called your house from 6:30 on till about 9:30, getting no answer. X I then called the station to try to find out something about the show but all they could give me was the number to call.

I decided that I should go through with the call and decided to ask S what I never got to in my interview with him--the spectro analysis--why it wasn't introduced into evidence if it was the proof. I figured if I explained the significane before posing the question, it would have a good effect on the public since spectro has rarely been discussed and is impressive to those who believe WR and remained to be convinced otherwise. I expected that he would evade and that if possible I would jump on him for doing so.

As soon as the show went on, I called and was the first person to get through. I was held on the line for 45 minutes, through 3 other questions by other callers. Then my turn came. I introduced myself to let him know who I was (his head went into his hands with that) and asked the question, which he did not answer and evaded superbly.

As to why the spectro was ommitted, he says that he asked Frazier about all the tests and that all the tests were performed. I told him that he evaded my answer and a lot of discussion came about.

I got most of it on tape. Being the clutz that I am, I managed to erase a little bit of the end of the conversation. This was mostly familiarities and not subject matter. (He went, "Are you the boy from the Northeast? Hi! How are you?" I said "Fine, and you?" Then old Arlen gave old Arlen a big pat on the back and told the people, "I saw him for X the better part of two hours last year at a time when I was very busy with the campaign and everything." Well, he saw me for a begrudged half hour <u>after</u> the election.

McKinney seemed very interested. All in all, we talked for about 15 minutes. I believe I got the best of him, at least gave him the run-around. Damnit, though, I don't even know how the thing ended thanks to my bumbling with the tape. I never did get an answer to my question. I made some errors which S, by his furious scribbling, apparently intends to check up on.

I decided to write him a letter explaining what I misquoted from Frazier's test and what I did not--these were the things he

challanged. He is shrewd, as evasive and dishonest as ever. I think the letter is not harmful. I believe it is a protection for me, for I think it establishes a record with him that I was willing to admit error--something he has not yet done. It also puts him in a position where he might answer my question.

As you can see, I sent a carbon to McKinney. I thanked him and asked if it would be possible for me to obtain either a transcript or a dub of my conversation with Specter, hoping that I could get what I erased. If no, then I'll call Salandria who probably must have been recording. I'd rather not do that though.

I don't have time now to go into details. I will try to get copies of the tape for you and Dick. I have enclosed a carbon of my letter to S for you. Unfortunately, I could not make another for Dick (too much paper in typewriter). As soon as I can, I'll get my carbon Xeroxed and send him a copy.

His evasion to the actual question was in the form of his usual self-preservation rhetoric. He didn't ~~XX~~ question Gallagher, therefore, he has nothing to do with it.

I really must get the full tape.

Extremely hurried,

cc Dick